arXiv:1610.00545v1 [math.SP] 3 Oct 2016

Various 3×3 Nonnegative Matrices with Prescribed Eigenvalues and Diagonal Entries

Jin Ok Hwang*and Donggyun Kim†
Department of Mathematics, Korea University

March 19 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we answer the various forms of nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problems with prescribed diagonal entries for order three: real or complex general matrices, symmetric stochastic matrices, and real or complex doubly stochastic matrices. We include the known cases, the symmetric matrices and real or complex stochastic matrices, to compare the other results and for completeness. In addition, for a given list of eigenvalues, we compute the exact range for the largest value of the diagonal entries of the various nonnegative matrices.

Keywords: nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problems, nonnegative matrices, symmetric matrices, stochastic matrices, symmetric stochastic matrices, doubly stochastic matrices
2010 MSC: 15A18, 15A51

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Preliminary **3**

3 General 3×3 nonnegative matrices **4**

4 Symmetric 3×3 nonnegative matrices **11**

5 Stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices **13**

6 Symmetric stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices **16**

7 Doubly stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices **21**

*aldif89@korea.ac.kr
†kim.donggyun@gmail.com

1 Introduction

The *nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem* (NIEP) is to determine necessary and sufficient conditions for a list of real or complex numbers to be the eigenvalues of some nonnegative matrix of real numbers. For a list Λ of numbers, if there exists a nonnegative matrix A with eigenvalues Λ, we say that Λ is *realizable* and that A *realizes* Λ. The nonnegative matrix could be of various forms: general, symmetric, stochastic, symmetric stochastic, and doubly stochastic nonnegative matrices. By a complex stochastic NIEP, we mean the NIEP of finding a stochastic nonnegative matrix over real numbers with complex eigenvalues.

The origin of the NIEP goes back to Kolmogorov [3] in 1937, who asked when a given complex number is an eigenvalue of some nonnegative matrix. Suleimanova [14] extended Kolmogorov's question to the NIEP form in 1949. Since then, vast literature has been devoted to its study, but we are far from a satisfactory solution.

Let n be the cardinality of list Λ. For the case $n = 3$, the general and symmetric NIEPs for a list of real numbers are straightforward, and the general NIEP for a list of complex numbers was solved by Loewy and London [5] in 1978. Perfect [10] in 1955 solved the stochastic NIEP for a list of real numbers and by a slight extension, Soto, Salas, and Manzaneda [13] in 2010 solved this problem for a complex list. In 1965, Perfect and Minsky [11] solved the symmetric stochastic and doubly stochastic NIEPs for lists of real and complex numbers.

For the case $n = 4$, in [5] in 1978, Loewy and London also gave a solution for a general NIEP for a list of real numbers. For a general NIEP for a list of complex numbers, a solution in terms of the power sums of the elements of Λ appeared in the Ph.D. thesis of Meehan [6] in 1998 and a solution in terms of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of a nonnegative matrix was published by Torre-Mayo, Abril-Raymundo, Alarcia-Estévez, Marijuán, and Pisonero [15] in 2007. Wuwen [16] presented a solution for the symmetric NIEP in 1996. For other NIEPs, only partial answers are known, see for example [8] and [9]. For the case $n \geq 5$, the NIEP is unsolved in the general case and we refer to [12].

We may ask further that for two given numerical lists Λ and Ω, what the necessary and sufficient conditions are for Λ to be the eigenvalues and Ω the diagonal entries of some nonnegative matrix [4]. We call this kind of question a NIEP with prescribed diagonal entries.

For the case $n = 3$, the symmetric NIEP with prescribed diagonal entries was solved by Fieldler [1] in 1974. The real stochastic NIEP with prescribed diagonal entries was solved by Perfect [10] in 1955 and by a slight extension, the complex stochastic NIEP with prescribed diagonal entries was solved by Soto, Salas, and Manzaneda [13] in 2010.

In this paper, we answer the various forms of nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problems with prescribed diagonal entries for $n = 3$: real or complex general matrices (section 3), symmetric stochastic matrices (section 6), and real or complex doubly stochastic matrices (section 7). We include the known cases, the symmetric matrices (section 4) and real or complex stochastic matrices (section 5), to compare the other results and for completeness. In addition, for a given list of eigenvalues, we compute the exact range for the largest value of the diagonal entries of the various nonnegative matrices.

2 Preliminary

We say that a matrix is *nonnegative* if all its entries are nonnegative real numbers. A basic theorem in the theory of nonnegative matrices, due to Perron and Frobenius, see for example [7], states that the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix A have to contain a nonnegative number that is greater than or equal to the absolute value of any member of the eigenvalues of A. Since for any nonnegative matrix A with eigenvalues $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n\}$ the trace of $A^k,\ k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is nonnegative, the following condition must hold.

$$s_k(\Lambda) = \lambda_1^k + \lambda_2^k + \cdots + \lambda_n^k \geq 0.$$

Loewy and London [5] and Johnson [2] independently proved the following result, known as the JLL inequalities:

$$n^{k-1} s^{km}(\Lambda) \geq \ s_m^k(\Lambda)$$

for all positive integers k and m. Since the characteristic polynomial of a nonnegative matrix is a polynomial over real numbers, the eigenvalues are closed under complex conjugation. These four statements are necessary conditions for the list Λ of complex numbers to be the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix. The necessary conditions are sufficient only when Λ has at most three elements [5].

Before we answer the various forms of NIEP with prescribed diagonal entries for $n = 3$, we present the cases for $n = 2$ which are trivial, but give a hint for the case $n = 3$.

Let A be a 2×2 nonnegative matrix over the field of real numbers. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, A has a nonnegative eigenvalue, and this implies that the other eigenvalue of A is also real.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ and $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ be lists of real numbers with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$ and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2$.*

1. *There is a general, symmetric, or stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1$ and 2,
   (ii) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$,
   (iii) $\omega_1\omega_2 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2$.

   Moreover, in this case, the exact range for ω_1 is

   $$\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_1\}$$

   and we have

   $$\omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1.$$

2. *There is a symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1$ and 2,

(ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \omega_1 + \omega_2$,

(iii) $\omega_1 = \omega_2$.

Moreover, in this case, we have

$$\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2).$$

3. *The list* Λ *consists of the eigenvalues of a general, symmetric, stochastic or symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following holds:*

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq 0.$$

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions in the first statement, we find the following general, symmetric and stochastic nonnegative matrices with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_1\omega_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 \\ 1 & \omega_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \sqrt{\omega_1\omega_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2} \\ \sqrt{\omega_1\omega_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2} & \omega_2 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_2 & \omega_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

for each condition, respectively.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions in the second statement, we find the following symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) & \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) & \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \end{pmatrix},$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω. Note that this matrix is symmetric doubly stochastic.

The proof is straightforward and one may refer to the proofs of the 3×3 matrix cases in the following sections.

3 General 3×3 nonnegative matrices

We discuss a general 3×3 nonnegative matrix case with prescribed real or complex eigenvalues and diagonal entries. Consider first the case of real eigenvalues.

Statement 3 in the following Theorem 3.1 was proved by Loewy and London [5], but here we prove statement 3 as a corollary of statements 1 and 2 in Theorem 3.1. This kind of pattern will appear repeatedly.

Theorem 3.1 (real, general case)**.** *Let* $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ *and* $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ *be lists of real numbers with* $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ *and* $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.

1. *There is a nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues* Λ *and diagonal entries* Ω *if and only if the lists* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy*

(i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, 2$ *and* 3,

(ii) $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1 \geq \lambda_2$,

(iii) $\omega_1 + \ \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$,

(iv) $\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

2. *If* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy the conditions of statement 1, then the exact range for* ω_1 *is*

$$\max\{\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \lambda_2\} \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1\}. \tag{3.1}$$

For the values of ω_2 *and* ω_3*, we may take*

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1). \tag{3.2}$$

3. *[5] The list* Λ *is realizable as the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,

(ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_2 - \omega_1)(\lambda_3 - \omega_1) \\ 1 & \omega_2 & \omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. Suppose that Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix A with diagonal entries Ω. Then, the elements ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 are nonnegative, and therefore, we have condition (i). The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ of A, using the eigenvalues Λ, is

$$\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda) = \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 - (\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3)\lambda + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3.$$

We may write the nonnegative matrix A as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & \omega_2 & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where all elements a_{ij} are nonnegative. Hence, we have another form of the characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ of A,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda) = {} & a_{12}a_{23}a_{31} + a_{13}a_{21}a_{32} - a_{23}a_{32}\omega_1 - a_{13}a_{31}\omega_2 - a_{12}a_{21}\omega_3 + \omega_1\omega_2\omega_3 \\ & - (\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - a_{12}a_{21} - a_{23}a_{32} - a_{13}a_{31})\lambda \\ & + (\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the two characteristic polynomials $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ must be identical. Comparing the coefficients of λ^2, we have

$$\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3,$$

which is condition (iii). Comparing the coefficients of λ, we have

$$\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - a_{12}a_{21} - a_{23}a_{32} - a_{13}a_{31} = \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3.$$

Since all elements a_{ij} are nonnegative, we have

$$\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3,$$

which is condition (iv).

Now, consider the expression $(\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_2 - \omega_1)(\lambda_3 - \omega_1)$. This is the value of $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\omega_1)$ and therefore, it must be the value of $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\omega_1)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_2 - \omega_1)(\lambda_3 - \omega_1)& \\ &= a_{12}a_{23}a_{31} + a_{13}a_{21}a_{32} + a_{13}a_{31}(\omega_1 - \omega_2) + a_{23}a_{32}(\omega_1 - \omega_3),\end{aligned}$$

which is nonnegative because ω_1 is larger than or equal to ω_2 and ω_3 by assumption. From $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$, we have $\omega_1 \leq \lambda_3$ or $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1 \geq \lambda_2$. If $\omega_1 \leq \lambda_3$, then for $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ to be true, it must be that$\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$. Hence, this case is resolved in the case that $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1 \geq \lambda_2$, which is condition (ii). Therefore, a nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv).

Now, suppose that lists Λ and Ω satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Let B be the following matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_2 - \omega_1)(\lambda_3 - \omega_1) \\ 1 & \omega_2 & \omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, B is nonnegative by conditions (i), (ii), and (iv). The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda)$ of B is factored as

$$\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda) = \det(B - \lambda I) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda)(\lambda_2 - \lambda)(\lambda_3 - \lambda),$$

where we use condition (iii) for factorization. Therefore, the eigenvalues of B are Λ, and this concludes statement 1.

2. Assume that statement 1 holds. We first show that if number ω_1 is within range (3.1), then taking numbers ω_2 and ω_3 with expression (3.2), list Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). Second, we show that if number ω_1 is out of range (3.1), Ω does not satisfy them.

   Suppose that Ω is within ranges (3.1) and (3.2). Then, we have $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, which is nonnegative by (3.1). Hence, we obtain $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$. From an ω_1 within range (3.1), we may compute that

$$\max\{0, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\} \leq \omega_3 \leq \min\{\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)\}.$$

Hence, $\omega_3 \geq 0$ and therefore, condition (i) holds. For a number ω_1 within range (3.1), we have $\lambda_2 \leq \omega_1 \leq \lambda_1$, which is condition (ii). Furthermore, a direct summation of ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 produces condition (iii). From numbers ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 within ranges (3.1) and (3.2), we obtain

$$\max\{-\lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3, \frac{1}{4}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2\} \leq \omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3.$$

Since $\max\{-\lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3, \frac{1}{4}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2\}$ is nonnegative, condition (iv) is satisfied. Therefore, if list Ω is within ranges (3.1) and (3.2), then Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv).

Now, consider the case when ω_1 is out of range (3.1). If $\omega_1 < \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$, then

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 > 3\omega_1 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3,$$

which violates condition (iii). If $\omega_1 < \lambda_2$, then it violates condition (ii). If $\omega_1 > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, then since ω_2 and ω_3 are nonnegative, $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, which violates condition (iii). If $\omega_1 > \lambda_1$, then it violates condition (ii). Therefore, if ω_1 is out of range (3.1), then Ω does not satisfy one of conditions (i)–(iv). Therefore, we conclude statement 2.

3. From statement 1, statement 3 is equivalent to the following: for a given list Λ, there is a list Ω with conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1 if and only if Λ satisfies conditions $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$. Hence, we give a proof for this statement.

   Suppose that there is a list Ω that satisfies conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1. Since the elements of Ω are nonnegative, by condition (iii) of statement 1, we have $\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3 \geq 0$. Again, from condition (iii) of statement 1, we have $\lambda_1+\lambda_3 = (\omega_1-\lambda_2)+\omega_2+\omega_3$. Then, by conditions (i) and (ii) of statement 1, we obtain $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$.

   Conversely, suppose that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$. Then, we may take values ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 to be in ranges (3.1) and (3.2). For example, let $\omega_1 = \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3, \lambda_1\}$ and $\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1)$. Then, by statement 2, Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1. Hence, we conclude statement 3.

□

Consider the case of complex eigenvalues.

Theorem 3.2 (complex, general case)**.** *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ be a list of complex numbers (containing a pair of complex conjugates) with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3|$ and let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be a list of real numbers with $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.*

1. *There is a nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2,$ and 3,

   (ii) $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1$,

(iii) $\omega_1 + \ \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$,

(iv) $\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

2. *If* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy the conditions of statement 1, the exact range for* ω_1 *is*

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_1\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$U_1 = \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3}. \tag{3.4}$$

For the values for ω_2 *and* ω_3*, we may take*

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1). \tag{3.5}$$

3. *[5] The list* Λ *is realizable as the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ *and* $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$,

(ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,

(iii) $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_2 - \omega_1)(\lambda_3 - \omega_1) \\ 1 & \omega_2 & \omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. The proof of statement 1 is almost identical to that of statement 1 of Theorem 3.1, even though the list Λ contains complex numbers.

2. Assuming that the statement 1 holds, we first show that if the number ω_1 is within range (3.3), then taking the numbers ω_2 and ω_3 with expression (3.5), the list Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). Second, we show that when ω_1 is out of range (3.3), Ω does not satisfy them.

   Suppose that Ω is within range (3.3) and (3.5). From expression (3.5), $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, which is nonnegative by (3.3). Hence, we obtain $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$. For ω_1 within range (3.3), we may compute that

$$\max\{0, \frac{1}{3}\left(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3}\right)\}$$
$$\leq \omega_3 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3).$$

Hence, $\omega_3 \geq 0$, and therefore, condition (i) holds.

When ω_1 is within range (3.3), we have $\omega_1 \leq U_1$. Furthermore, $U_1 \leq \lambda_1$ because

$$\lambda_1 - U_1 = \frac{2}{3}\lambda_1 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_2 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_3 - \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3},$$

and

$$\left(\frac{2}{3}\lambda_1 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_2 - \frac{1}{3}\lambda_3\right)^2 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3}\right)^2 = -(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2,$$

which is nonnegative from the equality $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$. Hence, we have $\omega_1 \leq \lambda_1$, and therefore, condition (ii) holds. The summation of ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 gives us condition (iii). From the numbers ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{-\lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3, 0\} \\ \leq \omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \leq \\ \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition (iv) is satisfied. Therefore, if the list Ω is within ranges (3.3) and (3.5), then Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv).

Now, we consider the case when ω_1 is out of range (3.3). If $\omega_1 < \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$, then

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 > 3\omega_1 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3,$$

which violates condition (iii). If $\omega_1 > \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, then, because ω_2 and ω_3 are nonnegative, condition (iii) is violated.

Now, let us consider the case when $\omega_1 > U_1$. Using $\omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1 - \omega_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ = -\omega_2^2 + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1)\omega_2 \\ + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\omega_1 - (\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3 + \omega_1^2).\end{aligned}$$

From statement (iii), we have $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 \geq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, hence $\omega_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1)$. Applying this inequality to the above expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ \leq -\frac{3}{4}\left(\omega_1^2 - \frac{2}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\omega_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 - 2\lambda_1\lambda_3 - 2\lambda_2\lambda_3)\right) \\ = -\frac{3}{4}\left(\omega_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3}\right) \\ \left(\omega_1 - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\omega_1 > U_1$, we have $\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 < 0$, which violates condition (iv) of statement 1. Therefore, if ω_1 is out of range (3.3), then Ω does not satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Hence, we conclude statement 2.

3. From statement 1, statement 3 is equivalent to the following: for a given list Λ, there is a list Ω with conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1 if and only if Λ satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) of statement 3. Hence, we give a proof for this statement.

   Suppose that Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1. By condition (i) of statement 1, we have $\lambda_1 \geq 0$. Since $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ is real, $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_2) = -\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_3)$. Since $0 = \mathrm{Im}(\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3) = (\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_2) - \mathrm{Re}(\lambda_3))\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_2)$ and Λ contains complex conjugates, we conclude that $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_2) = \mathrm{Re}(\lambda_3)$. Therefore, $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$, which is condition (i). Since the elements of Ω are nonnegative, we have $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$, which is condition (ii).

   Again, using condition (iii) of statement 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3 & \\
&= (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)^2 - 3(\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3) \\
&= (\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3)^2 - 3(\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left((\omega_1 - \omega_2)^2 + (\omega_1 - \omega_3)^2 + (\omega_2 - \omega_3)^2\right) \\
&\quad + 3(\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3),
\end{aligned}$$

   which is nonnegative by condition (iv) of statement 1. Therefore, Λ satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) of statement 3.

   Conversely, suppose that Λ satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) of statement 3. Then, we may take values ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 from ranges (3.3) and (3.5). For example, take $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$. Then, by statement 2, Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1. Hence, we conclude statement 3.

□

From statement 1 of Theorem 3.2, we may write $\lambda_1 = a, \lambda_2 = b + ci$ and $\lambda_3 = b - ci$ where a, b, and c are real numbers. We restate statements 2 and 3 of Theorem 3.2 in terms of a, b, and c. Note that Λ is now $\{a, b + ci, b - ci\}$.

Corollary 3.3. *1. The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $a \geq 0$,
(ii) $-\frac{a}{2} \leq b \leq a$,
(iii) $(a - b)^2 \geq 3c^2$.

2. The exact range for ω_1 is

$$\frac{1}{3}(a + 2b) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{a + 2b, \frac{1}{3}(a + 2b) + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{(a - b)^2 - 3c^2}\}.$$

4 Symmetric 3×3 nonnegative matrices

We discuss a symmetric 3×3 nonnegative matrix case with prescribed eigenvalues and diagonal entries. The following theorem was solved by Fieldler [1] in 1974, except for statement 2, but we include here the theorem and proof to compare the other results and for completeness.

Theorem 4.1 (symmetric case)**.** *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ and $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be lists of real numbers with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.*

1. *[1] There is a symmetric nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2,$ and 3,
   (ii) $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1 \geq \lambda_2$,
   (iii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2$,
   (iv) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3$.

2. *If Λ and Ω satisfy the conditions of statement 1, then the exact range for ω_1 is*

$$\max\{\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \lambda_2\} \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1\}. \tag{4.1}$$

   For the values for ω_2 and ω_3, we may take

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1). \tag{4.2}$$

3. *[1] The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a symmetric nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

   (i) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,
   (ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following symmetric nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \sqrt{\frac{\beta\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{\beta\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \omega_2 & \sqrt{\alpha\beta} \\ \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \sqrt{\alpha\beta} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_2$, $\beta = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_3$, and $\gamma = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\omega_1 - \lambda_2)$, with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. The proof is similar to that of statement 1 of Theorem 3.1 except for condition (*iii*). Therefore, we give the proof related to condition (*iii*). Assume that the list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a symmetric nonnegative matrix A with diagonal entries

Ω. Then, there is an orthogonal matrix $U = \{u_{ij}\}$ such that $A = U^{\mathrm{tr}}[\Lambda]U$ where $[\Lambda]$ is the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries Λ. Then, in particular, we have

$$\omega_3 = u_{13}^2\lambda_1 + u_{23}^2\lambda_2 + u_{33}^2\lambda_3.$$

Since $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$, we have

$$\omega_3 \geq (u_{13}^2 + u_{23}^2 + u_{33}^2)\lambda_3.$$

Since U is orthogonal, $u_{13}^2 + u_{23}^2 + u_{33}^2 = 1$, and hence $\omega_3 \geq \lambda_3$. From condition (iv), we obtain

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2,$$

which is condition (iii).

Now, suppose that the lists Λ and Ω satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Let B be the following matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \sqrt{\frac{\beta\,\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\,\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{\beta\,\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \omega_2 & \sqrt{\alpha\,\beta} \\ \sqrt{\frac{\alpha\,\gamma}{\alpha+\beta}} & \sqrt{\alpha\,\beta} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_2$, $\beta = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_3$, and $\gamma = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\omega_1 - \lambda_2)$. Then, B is a symmetric nonnegative matrix by conditions (i)–(iii). The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}(\lambda)$ of B is factored as

$$\mathrm{Ch}(\lambda) = \det(B - \lambda I) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda)(\lambda_2 - \lambda)(\lambda_3 - \lambda),$$

where we use condition (iv). Therefore, the eigenvalues of B are Λ, hence this concludes statement 1.

2, 3. Suppose that Ω is within ranges (4.1) and (4.2). Then, a direct computation shows that

$$\max\{\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3), -\lambda_3\} \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_2.$$

Therefore, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \omega_1 - \omega_2$ is nonnegative, which is condition (iii). For the other part of the proof, see the proofs of statements 2 and 3 of Theorem 3.1.

□

There appear two conditions: $\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$ in Theorem 3.1 and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2$ in Theorem 4.1. It is interesting to compare conditions.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ and $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be lists of real numbers with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$. Suppose that $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1 \geq \lambda_2$ and $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$. Then, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \geq \omega_1 + \omega_2$ implies*

$$\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3.$$

Proof. We may write that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_1\omega_2+\omega_1\omega_3+\omega_2\omega_3-\lambda_1\lambda_2-\lambda_1\lambda_3-\lambda_2\lambda_3 \\ &= (\lambda_1-\omega_1)(\omega_1-\lambda_2)+(\omega_2-\lambda_3)(\omega_3-\lambda_3) \\ &\quad +(\omega_1+\lambda_3)(\omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_1+\lambda_2\geq\omega_1+\omega_2$ implies $\omega_3\geq\lambda_3$, each term of the right-hand side of the equality is nonnegative, hence we conclude the proposition. □

Remark 4.3. The converse of Proposition 4.2 is false. Let $\Lambda=\{1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}\}$ and $\Omega=\{\frac{4}{5},\frac{3}{4},\frac{1}{5}\}$. Then, $\omega_1\omega_2+\omega_1\omega_3+\omega_2\omega_3-\lambda_1\lambda_2-\lambda_1\lambda_3-\lambda_2\lambda_3=\frac{7}{100}$ is positive, but $\lambda_1+\lambda_2-\omega_1-\omega_2=-\frac{1}{20}$ is negative.

5 Stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices

We discuss a stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrix case with prescribed real or complex eigenvalues and diagonal entries. Consider first the case of real eigenvalues. The following theorem was solved by Perfect [10] in 1955, except for statement 2, but we include here the theorem and proof to compare the other results and for completeness.

Throughout the paper, when we refer a *stochastic* matrix, we mean a generalized stochastic matrix, that is, the sum of entries in every row is fixed. Further, when we refer a doubly *stochastic* matrix, we mean a generalized doubly stochastic matrix, that is, the sum of entries in every row and every column is fixed. In both cases, the sum of entries in a row is the largest eigenvalue.

Theorem 5.1 (real, stochastic case)**.** *Let $\Lambda=\{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3\}$ and $\Omega=\{\omega_1,\omega_2,\omega_3\}$ be lists of real numbers with $\lambda_1\geq\lambda_2\geq\lambda_3$ and $\omega_1\geq\omega_2\geq\omega_3$.*

1. *[10] There is a stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i\geq0$ for $i=1,2,$ and 3,

   (ii) $\lambda_1\geq\omega_1\geq\lambda_2$,

   (iii) $\omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3=\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3$,

   (iv) $\omega_1\omega_2+\omega_1\omega_3+\omega_2\omega_3\geq\lambda_1\lambda_2+\lambda_1\lambda_3+\lambda_2\lambda_3$.

2. *If Λ and Ω satisfy the conditions of statement 1, then the exact range for ω_1 is*

$$\max\{\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3),\lambda_2\}\leq\omega_1\leq\min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3,\lambda_1\} \tag{5.1}$$

   For the values for ω_2 and ω_3, we may take

$$\omega_2=\omega_3=\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1). \tag{5.2}$$

3. *[10] The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

   (i) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,

   (ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p & \omega_2 & p \\ 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_3 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$p = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda_1 - \omega_3}(\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3), & \lambda_1 \neq \omega_3; \\ 0, & \lambda_1 = \omega_3, \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. Suppose that the list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a stochastic nonnegative matrix with diagonal entries Ω. Since such a stochastic nonnegative matrix is a general nonnegative matrix, by Theorem 3.1, the lists Ω and Λ satisfy conditions (i)–(iv).

Now, suppose that the lists Ω and Λ satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Let C be the following stochastic matrix:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p & \omega_2 & p \\ 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_3 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where p is defined in (5.3). Each entry of the matrix is nonnegative. We now check the nonnegativity of $\lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p$. Consider the numerator of $\lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p$:

$$(\lambda_1 - \omega_2)(\lambda_1 - \omega_3) - (\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3).$$

Using condition (iii) and substituting λ_1 with $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3$, the expression becomes

$$(\omega_1 - \lambda_2)(\omega_1 - \lambda_3).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p = (\omega_1 - \lambda_2)(\omega_1 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_1 - \omega_3)^{-1}, \tag{5.4}$$

which is nonnegative. Therefore, C is nonnegative. A direct computation shows that the eigenvalues of C are Λ, hence this concludes statement 1. For the proof of statements 2 and 3, refer to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

□

Consider the case of complex eigenvalues. The following theorem was solved by by Soto, Salas, and Manzaneda [13] in 2010, except for statement 2, but we include here the theorem and proof to compare the other results and for completeness.

Theorem 5.2 (complex, stochastic case)**.** *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ be a list of complex numbers (containing a pair of complex conjugates) with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3|$ and let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be a list of real numbers with $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.*

1. *[13] There is a stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1$, 2, and 3,
   (ii) $\lambda_1 \geq \omega_1$,
   (iii) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$,
   (iv) $\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

2. *If Λ and Ω satisfy the conditions of statement 1, the exact range for ω_1 is*

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_1\}, \tag{5.5}$$

   where U_1 is as defined in (3.4). For the values for ω_2 and ω_3, we may take

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1). \tag{5.6}$$

3. *[13] The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

   (i) $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$,
   (ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,
   (iii) $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p & \omega_2 & p \\ 0 & \lambda_1 - \omega_3 & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where p is in (5.3), with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. The proof of this theorem is similar to that of Theorem 3.2 or 5.1 except for the argument about the equation (5.4). We consider that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - p &= (\omega_1 - \lambda_2)(\omega_1 - \lambda_3)(\lambda_1 - \omega_3)^{-1} \\ &= \left(\left(\omega_1 - \mathrm{Re}(\lambda_2)\right)^2 + (\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_2))^2\right)(\lambda_1 - \omega_3)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is nonnegative. This completes the proof of this Theorem. □

From statement 1 of Theorem 5.2, without loss of generality we may write $\lambda_1 = a, \lambda_2 = b + ci$, and $\lambda_3 = b - ci$ where a, b, and c are real numbers. We restate statements 2 and 3 of Theorem 5.2 in terms of a, b and c. Note that the list Λ is now $\{a, b + ci, b - ci\}$.

Corollary 5.3. *1. The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $a \geq 0$,
(ii) $-\frac{a}{2} \leq b \leq a$,
(iii) $(a-b)^2 \geq 3c^2$.

2. The exact range for ω_1 is

$$\frac{1}{3}(a+2b) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{a+2b, \frac{1}{3}(a+2b) + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{(a-b)^2 - 3c^2}\}.$$

6 Symmetric stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices

We discuss a symmetric stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrix case with prescribed eigenvalues and diagonal entries. Statement 3 in the following Theorem 6.1 was proved by Perfect and Minsky [11, proof of Theorem 14] in 1965.

Theorem 6.1 (symmetric stochastic case)**.** *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ and $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be lists of real numbers with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.*

1. There is a symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy

(i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ *for $i = 1, 2,$ and 3,*
(ii) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$,
(iii) $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$,
(iv) $(\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)$.

2. If Λ and Ω satisfy the conditions of statement 1, then the exact range for ω_1 is

$$\max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\} \leq \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2), \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \\ L_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)}, \\ L_3 &= \frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

For the values for ω_2 and ω_3, we have

$$\omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_3)}, \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1) - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_3)}. \tag{6.4}$$

3. *[11] The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following holds:*

$$2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0.$$

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \\ \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_2 & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \\ \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. Suppose that the list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix A with diagonal entries Ω. Then, the elements ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 are nonnegative, and therefore, we have condition (i). The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ of A, using the eigenvalues Λ, is

$$\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda) = \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 - (\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3)\lambda + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3.$$

We may write the symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix A without loss of generality as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & s & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 - s \\ s & \omega_2 & \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - s \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_1 - s & \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - s & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where each entry is nonnegative and $\omega_3 = 2s + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \lambda_1$. Then, we have another form of the characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ of A, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda) = (-3s^2 + (2s - \omega_1 - \omega_2)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2)\lambda_1 \\ - (-3s^2 + (4s + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - 2\lambda_1)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2)\lambda \\ + (\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the two characteristic polynomials $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ must be identical. Comparing the coefficients of λ^2, we have

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3,$$

which is condition (ii). From $\omega_3 = 2s + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \lambda_1$, we have $s = \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2}$, which is nonnegative, hence condition (iii) holds. Comparing the coefficients of λ, we have

$$\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3 = -3s^2 + (4s + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - 2\lambda_1)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2.$$

Then, substituting s^2 by $(\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2$ and s by $\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \omega_1 - \omega_2$, we obtain

$$(\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3),$$

which is condition (iv). Therefore, all conditions (i)–(iv) are satisfied.

Now, suppose that lists Λ and Ω satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Let B be the following matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \\ \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_2 & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \\ \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Because of condition (iii), which is $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$, and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3 \geq 0$, we have that $\omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$ and $\omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$. Hence, the matrix B is nonnegative. All the sums of each row entries are equal to λ_1, and hence the matrix B is symmetric stochastic. The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda)$ of B is factored as

$$\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda) = \det(B - \lambda I) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda)(\lambda_2 - \lambda)(\lambda_3 - \lambda),$$

where we use conditions (iii) and (iv), and therefore, the eigenvalues of B are Λ. Therefore, we have a symmetric stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω, hence this concludes statement 1.

3. Here, we prove statement 3. From statement 1, statement 3 is equivalent to the following: for a given list Λ, there is a list Ω with conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1 if and only if Λ satisfies condition $2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0$. Hence, we give a proof for this statement.

   Suppose that there is a list Ω with conditions (i)–(iv) of statement 1. Let $p = 2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3$ and $q = 2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3$. Then their sum is $p + q = 4(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$, and by conditions (i) and (ii) of statement 1, it is nonnegative. Their product is

$$\begin{aligned} p\,q =& (2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \\ =& (2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \\ & - 12\left((\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 - (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) + \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)\right) \\ & + 12(\lambda_1 + \omega_3)(\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) \\ =& 12(\omega_1\omega_2 + \omega_1\omega_3 + \omega_2\omega_3), \end{aligned}$$

   where we use conditions (ii) and (iv). Each of ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 is nonnegative, hence the product $p\,q$ is nonnegative. Since the sum and product of reals p and q are nonnegative, the values p and q are nonnegative, hence we have $2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0$.

   Conversely, we suppose that $2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0$. We let

$$\omega_1 = \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2) \text{ and } \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3).$$

   Then, a direct computation shows that these ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Therefore, statement 3 holds.

2. We need the following lemma to prove statement 2.

Lemma 6.2. *Let R be the region bounded by*

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{1}{3}(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2) \le \lambda_3 \le \lambda_2.$$

Let R_1 be the subregion of R bounded by

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } \max\{-\frac{\lambda_1}{2}, -2\lambda_1+3\lambda_2\} \le \lambda_3 \le \lambda_2,$$

R_2 be the subregion of R bounded by

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{1}{3}(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2) \le \lambda_3 \le \min\{-\frac{\lambda_1}{2}, -\lambda_2\},$$

and R_3 be the subregion of R bounded by

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\lambda_2 \le \lambda_3 \le -2\lambda_1+3\lambda_2.$$

Then, $L_1 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on the subregion R_1, $L_2 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on the subregion R_2, and $L_3 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on the subregion R_3.

Proof. Expression L_1 is well defined on the whole region R. Expression L_2 on R is well defined on the subregion $-(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1+2\lambda_3) \ge 0$ or equivalently

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_3 \le -\frac{\lambda_1}{2}.$$

It is a subregion of $R_2 \cup R_3$. Expression L_3 on R is well defined on the subregion $-(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2-3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1-3\lambda_2+\lambda_3) \ge 0$ or, equivalently,

$$\lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_3 \le -2\lambda_1+3\lambda_2,$$

a subregion of $R_2 \cup R_3$. On region R_1, only L_1 is well defined, and therefore, $L_1 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on R_1. On region R_2,

$$L_2 - L_1 = \frac{1}{6}(\lambda_1+2\lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1+2\lambda_3)} \ge 0,$$

therefore $L_2 \ge L_1$ on R_2. Let r_2 be the region bounded by

$$-\frac{2}{5}\lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{1}{3}(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2) \le \lambda_3 \le \min\{-2\lambda_1+3\lambda_2, -\lambda_2\}.$$

Then, r_2 is a subregion of R_2 and on R_2, L_3 is well defined on r_2. On r_2, $L_2 - L_3 \ge 0$ by a direct computation. Hence, $L_2 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on R_2. On region R_3,

$$L_3 - L_1 = \frac{1}{12}(2\lambda_1-3\lambda_2+\lambda_3) + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2-3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1-3\lambda_2+\lambda_3)} \ge 0,$$

therefore $L_3 \ge L_1$ on R_3. Let r_3 be the region bounded by

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \le \lambda_2 \le \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\lambda_2 \le \lambda_3 \le -\frac{\lambda_1}{2}.$$

Then, r_3 is a subregion of R_3 and on R_3, L_2 is well defined on r_3. On r_3, $L_3 - L_2 \ge 0$ by a direct computation. Hence, $L_3 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ on R_3. □

We now prove statement 2. Assuming that statement 1 holds, we solve two equations (ii) and (iv), and then, for ω_2 and ω_3 we have the values (6.3) and (6.4). We first show that if the number ω_1 is within range (6.1), then taking numbers ω_2 and ω_3 with expression (6.3) and (6.4), Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). Second, we show that when ω_1 is out of range (6.1), Ω does not satisfy them.

Suppose that list Ω satisfies range (6.1) and expressions (6.3) and (6.4). Then, we obtain $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ and

$$(\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)$$

by a direct computation. Hence, conditions (ii) and (iv) hold.

We now show the inequality $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3 \geq 0$. From the range of ω_1 in (6.1), we have

$$\frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \leq \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2).$$

Using the value ω_2, we obtain $0 \leq \omega_1 - \omega_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, hence $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2$. In the same manner, using the value ω_2, we obtain $0 \leq \omega_2 - \omega_3 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, hence $\omega_2 \geq \omega_3$. Using the range of ω_1 and the value ω_3, we have $\frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3) \leq \omega_3 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)$. From statement 3, $2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0$ implies $\omega_3 \geq 0$, hence condition (i) holds.

Now, we show the inequality $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$. On region R_1, by Lemma 6.2 we have

$$L_1 \leq \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \leq \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2).$$

Since $-2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$ on R_1, we have $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$ on R_1. On region R_2, by Lemma 6.2 we have

$$L_2 \leq \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2).$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{12}(u - v) \leq \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u =& 3(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - l, \\ v =& \sqrt{-3(\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 + l)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 + l)}, \text{ and} \\ l =& \sqrt{-3(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

We may easily check that u and v are nonnegative on R_2. Hence, $u - v \geq 0$ if and only if $u^2 - v^2 \geq 0$. By a direct computation we have

$$u^2 - v^2 = 12(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)(-3\lambda_1 + l).$$

On R_2 we have $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \le 0$. In addition, we have $-3\lambda_1 + l \le 0$, because

$$-(3\lambda_1)^2 + l^2 = -6(\lambda_1(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3) - 2\lambda_3(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)) \le 0,$$

where we use $2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \ge 0$, $\lambda_1 \ge 0$, $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \ge 0$, and $\lambda_3 \le 0$ on R_2. Therefore, $u^2 - v^2 \ge 0$ and therefore, $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \ge 0$ on R_2. On region R_3, by Lemma 6.2 we have

$$L_3 \le \omega_1 \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2).$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{24}(u - v) \le \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u =& 6\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3 - l, \\ v =& \sqrt{-3(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 - 5\lambda_3 + l)(2\lambda_1 - 5\lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 + l)}, \text{ and} \\ l =& \sqrt{-3(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

We may check that u and v are nonnegative on R_3 and $u^2 = v^2$. Hence, $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \ge 0$ on R_3. Therefore Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv).

Now, consider the other case when the number ω_1 is out of range (6.1). Assume that $\omega_1 > \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)$. Then, the inside of the square root part of ω_2 is negative, hence ω_2 is not real, violating the assumption that ω_2 is real.

Consider region R_1 and assume that $\omega_1 < L_1$. For $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3) \le \omega_1 < L_1$, a direct computation gives $\omega_1 < \omega_2$, violating condition $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$. For $\omega_1 < \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)$, ω_2 is not real, violating the assumption that ω_2 is real.

Consider region R_2 and assume that $\omega_1 < L_2$. For $L_1 \le \omega_1 < L_2$, a direct computation gives $\omega_3 < 0$, violating condition $\omega_3 \ge 0$. For $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3) \le \omega_1 < L_1$, we have $\omega_1 < \omega_2$, violating condition $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$. For $\omega_1 < \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)$, we have that ω_2 is not real, violating the assumption that ω_2 is real.

Consider region R_3 and assume that $\omega_1 < L_3$. For $L_1 \le \omega_1 < L_3$, a direct computation gives $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} < 0$, violating condition $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \ge 0$. For $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3) \le \omega_1 < L_1$, we have $\omega_1 < \omega_2$, violating condition $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$. For $\omega_1 < \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)$, we have that ω_2 is not real, violating the pre-assumption that ω_2 is real. Therefore if ω_1 is out of range (6.1), then Ω does not satisfy conditions (i)–(iv). Hence, we conclude statement 2.

□

7 Doubly stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrices

We discuss a double stochastic 3×3 nonnegative matrix case with prescribed real or complex eigenvalues and diagonal entries. Consider first the case of real eigenvalues. Statement 3 in the following Theorem 7.1 was proved by Perfect and Minsky [11] in 1965.

Theorem 7.1 (real, doubly stochastic case)**.** *Let* $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ *and* $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ *be lists of real numbers with* $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3$ *and* $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.

1. *There is a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues* Λ *and diagonal entries* Ω *if and only if the lists* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1$*, 2, and 3,*
   (ii) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$*,*
   (iii) $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$*,*
   (iv) $(\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \geq 0$*,*
   (v) $(\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 \geq (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)$.

2. *If* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy the conditions of statement 1, then the exact range for* ω_1 *is*

$$\max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\} \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_2\}, \tag{7.1}$$

   where L_1, L_2 *and* L_3 *are defined in (6.2) and*

$$U_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}. \tag{7.2}$$

   For the values for ω_2 *and* ω_3*, we may take*

$$\omega_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1) \\ \qquad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_3)}, & \text{if } \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2), \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1), & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

   and

$$\omega_3 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1) \\ \qquad - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - 2\lambda_3)}, & \text{if } \omega_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2), \\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.4}$$

3. *[11] The list* Λ *is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following holds:*

$$2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3 \geq 0.$$

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$W = (\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2})^2 - (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) + \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3), \tag{7.5}$$

with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. Suppose that the list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix A with diagonal entries Ω. Then, the elements ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 are nonnegative, hence we have condition (i). The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ of A, using the eigenvalues, is

$$\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda) = \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 - (\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3)\lambda + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3.$$

We may write the doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix A without loss of generality as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & s & \lambda_1 - \omega_1 - s \\ t & \omega_2 & \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - t \\ \lambda_1 - \omega_1 - t & \lambda_1 - \omega_2 - s & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where each entry is nonnegative and $\omega_3 = s + t + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \lambda_1$. From this matrix we have another form of the characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ of A, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda) = (-3s\,t + (s + t - \omega_1 - \omega_2)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2)\lambda_1 \\ - (-3s\,t + (2s + 2t + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - 2\lambda_1)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2)\lambda \\ + (\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3)\lambda^2 - \lambda^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the two characteristic polynomials $\mathrm{Ch}_1(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{Ch}_2(\lambda)$ are identical. Comparing the coefficients of λ^2, we have

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3,$$

which is condition (ii). From $\omega_3 = s + t + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \lambda_1$ we have

$$\frac{s+t}{2} = \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2},$$

which is nonnegative because s and t are nonnegative, hence we have (iii). Comparing the coefficients of λ, we have

$$\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3 = -3s\,t + (2s + 2t + \omega_1 + \omega_2 - 2\lambda_1)\lambda_1 + 3\omega_1\omega_2.$$

Then,

$$s\,t = (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3),$$

which is nonnegative, hence condition (iv) holds. By the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means, we have $(\frac{s+t}{2})^2 - s\,t \geq 0$, which is condition (v). Therefore all conditions (i)–(v) are satisfied.

Now, suppose that the lists Λ and Ω satisfy conditions (i)–(v). Let B be the following matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where W is defined in (7.5). By condition (i), ω_i is nonnegative for $i = 1$, 2, and 3. Let $s = \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W}$ and $t = \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W}$. The number W is nonnegative by condition (v), hence s and t are real numbers. Since the sum $s + t$ and product $s\,t$ are nonnegative by conditions (iii) and (iv), respectively, we have that s and t are nonnegative.

Because $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \geq 0$ and $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$ by pre-assumption, we have that $\omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \geq 0$ and $\omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \geq 0$. Hence, the matrix B is nonnegative. All sums of each row and column entries are equal to λ_1, hence the matrix B is doubly stochastic. The characteristic polynomial $\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda)$ of B is factored as

$$\mathrm{Ch}_3(\lambda) = \det(B - \lambda I) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda)(\lambda_2 - \lambda)(\lambda_3 - \lambda),$$

where we use conditions (ii), and therefore, the eigenvalues of B are Λ. Therefore, we obtain a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω, hence this concludes statement 1.

3. The proof of statement 3 is similar to that of statement 3 of Theorem 6.1, hence we omit it.

2. We need the following lemma to prove statement 2.

Lemma 7.2. *Let R be the region bounded by*

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{1}{3}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \leq \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_2.$$

Let Q_1 be the subregion of R bounded by

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{1}{3}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \leq \lambda_3 \leq \min\{\lambda_2, -\frac{\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}\},$$

and Q_2 the subregion of R bounded by

$$(-2 + \sqrt{3})\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 \text{ and } -\frac{\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \leq \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_2.$$

Then, $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3,\ U_2\}$ on subregion Q_1 and $U_2 = \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_2\}$ on subregion Q_2.

Proof. We have

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - U_2 = \lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}.$$

Since $\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$, we consider that

$$\left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}\right)^2$$
$$= \frac{2}{3}(\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3).$$

On Q_1, we have $\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2+2\lambda_1\lambda_3+\lambda_2\lambda_3 \le 0$, hence $\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3 \le U_2$, which says that $\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3 = \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3,\ U_2\}$ on Q_1. On Q_2, we have $\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2+2\lambda_1\lambda_3+\lambda_2\lambda_3 \ge 0$, that is, $\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3 \ge U_2$, which says that $U_2 = \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3,\ U_2\}$ on Q_2. □

We assume that statement 1 holds. Then, from statement 3, we have $2\lambda_1+\lambda_2+3\lambda_3 \ge 0$. We first show that if the number ω_1 is within range (7.1), then taking numbers ω_2 and ω_3 with expression (7.3) and (7.4), the list Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). Second, we show that when ω_1 is out of range (7.1), Ω does not satisfy them.

Suppose that Ω is within ranges (7.1) − (7.4). We split the range of ω_1 into two subranges. Assume first that ω_1 is in the subrange

$$\max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\} \le \omega_1 \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2),$$

and then take

$$\omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1) + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1-\lambda_1-2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1-\lambda_1-2\lambda_3)},$$

and

$$\omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1) - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{-(3\omega_1-\lambda_1-2\lambda_2)(3\omega_1-\lambda_1-2\lambda_3)}.$$

Then, the list Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv), which follows from the proof of statement 2 of Theorem 6.1.

Now, assume the other subrange

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2) \le \omega_1 \le \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3, U_2\},$$

and then take

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1).$$

From this assumption we can check $\omega_1+\omega_2+\omega_3 = \lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3$, which is condition (ii).

Consider the list Λ on region Q_1. On Q_1, by Lemma 7.2, $\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3 = \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3, U_2\}$, hence $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2) \le \omega_1 \le \lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3$. Since $\omega_1-\omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(3\omega_1-\lambda_1-\lambda_2-\lambda_3)$, $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2-\lambda_3) \le \omega_1-\omega_2 \le \lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3$. Hence, $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$. Since $\omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1)$, $0 \le \omega_3 \le \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2+3\lambda_3)$. Therefore, condition (i) holds.

From $0 \le \omega_3 \le \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1+\lambda_2+3\lambda_3)$, we have $-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2+\lambda_3) \le \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)$. However, on Q_1, $\lambda_3 \le -\frac{\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1+\lambda_2}$, which implies

$$-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2+\lambda_3) \ge -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \frac{\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1+\lambda_2}) = \frac{\lambda_1^2-\lambda_2^2}{4\lambda_1+2\lambda_2} \ge 0.$$

Therefore, condition (iii) holds.

Let $V = (\lambda_1-\omega_1)(\lambda_1-\omega_2)-\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)$. Using $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1+2\lambda_2) \le \omega_1 \le \lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3$ and $w_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\omega_1)$, we have that $-\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2+2\lambda_1\lambda_3+\lambda_2\lambda_3) \le V \le \frac{1}{9}(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)^2$. On Q_1, $\lambda_3 \le -\frac{\lambda_1^2+2\lambda_1\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1+\lambda_2}$, which implies $-\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3) \ge 0$. Hence, condition (iv) holds.

Now, consider the number W defined in (7.5). Using $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2) \le \omega_1 \le \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ and $w_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1)$, we have $0 \le W \le \frac{1}{12}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3)$. Hence, condition (v) holds.

Next consider the list Λ on region Q_2. On Q_2, by Lemma 7.2, we have $U_2 = \min\{\lambda_1+\lambda_2+\lambda_3, U_2\}$, hence $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2) \le \omega_1 \le U_2$. Let $S = \sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}$.

Then, we have $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) \le \omega_1 - \omega_2 \le \frac{1}{4}(-2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}S$, hence $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$. Furthermore, we have $\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}S \le \omega_3 \le \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 3\lambda_3)$. Consider $\left(\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}S\right)^2 = \frac{1}{6}(\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3)$, which is nonnegative on Q_2, hence $\omega_3 \ge 0$. Therefore, condition (i) holds.

A direct computation shows $\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}S \le \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$. On Q_2, $\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}S > 0$, because $\left(\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}S\right)^2 = \frac{1}{6}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \ge 0$. Therefore, condition (iii) holds.

A direct computation shows that on Q_2, $0 \le V \le \frac{1}{9}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2$. Therefore, condition (iv) holds.

In addition, a direct computation gives $0 \le W \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + \frac{1}{8}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2 - \frac{1}{8\sqrt{3}}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)S$. Hence, condition (v) satisfies. Therefore, list Ω satisfies the all conditions (i)–(v).

Now, consider the other case when the number ω_1 is out of range (7.1). Assume first $\omega_1 < \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$. Consider subregion R_1. On R_1, since $L_1 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, $\omega_1 < \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, which implies $\omega_1 < L_1$. We will show that there is no pair (ω_1, ω_2) that satisfies conditions (i)–(v) and $\omega_1 < L_1$ on region R_1. Indeed it is sufficient to show that if a pair (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies (i) and (ii) and $\omega_1 < L_1$, then it violates condition (v), i.e., $W < 0$.

It is convenient to view a pair (ω_1, ω_2) as a point on a $(\omega_1, \omega_2)-$ plane and λ_1, λ_2, and λ_3 as constants. If a point (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies conditions (a) $\omega_1 \ge \omega_2$, (b) $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 \ge \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ (which comes from $\omega_2 \ge \omega_3$ and (ii)), and (c) $\omega_1 < L_1$, then (ω_1, ω_2) is a point on the polygon of vertices p_0, p_1, and p_2 containing the line segments p_0p_1, and p_0p_2, but not containing the line segment p_1p_2, where

$$p_0 = \left(\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right),$$
$$p_1 = \left(\frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right) \text{ and}$$
$$p_2 = \left(\frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \frac{1}{12}(4\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2 + 5\lambda_3)\right).$$

We may check that the point p_0 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ and $\omega_1 = \omega_2$, the point p_1 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $\omega_1 = L_1$, and the point p_2 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = L_1$ and $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$.

We can view W as a function of variables ω_1 and ω_2, that is,

$$W(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \omega_1 - \omega_2)^2 - (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) + \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3).$$

Then, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is an elliptic paraboloid which opens upward with minimum at p_0, and we have that $W(p_0) = -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2$, $W(p_1) = 0$ and $W(p_2) = -\frac{1}{16}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2$, which are all nonpositive on region R_1. Therefore, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2) < 0$ for each point (ω_1, ω_2) on this polygon.

Consider subregion R_2. On R_2, since $L_2 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, then $\omega_1 < \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, which implies $\omega_1 < L_2$. We will show that there is no point (ω_1, ω_2) that satisfies conditions (i)–(v) and $\omega_1 < L_2$ on region R_2. Indeed it is enough to show that if (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies (i), (ii) and $\omega_1 < L_2$, then it violates condition (v), i.e., $W < 0$.

If a point (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies conditions (a) $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2$, (b) $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 \geq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, (c) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ (which comes from $\omega_3 \geq 0$ and (ii)) and (d) $\omega_1 < L_2$, then (ω_1, ω_2) is a point on the polygon of vertices p_0, p_3, p_4 and p_5 containing the boundary except the line segment p_4p_5, where

$$\begin{aligned} p_3 &= \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3),\ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right), \\ p_4 &= (L_2, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - L_2) \text{ and} \\ p_5 &= \left(L_2, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - L_2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We may check that the point p_3 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, the point p_4 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$ and $\omega_1 = L_2$, and the point p_5 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = L_1$ and $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$.

Then, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is an elliptic paraboloid which opens upward with minimum at p_0, and we have that $W(p_0) = -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2$, $W(p_3) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)$, $W(p_4) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} W(p_5) = -\frac{1}{48}\left((\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)^2 + (\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)^2 - (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2\right) \\ + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{3}}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\sqrt{-(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)(\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_3)}, \end{aligned}$$

which are all nonpositive on region R_2. Therefore, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2) < 0$ for each point (ω_1, ω_2) on this polygon.

Consider subregion R_3. On R_3, since $L_3 = \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, we have $\omega_1 < \max\{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$, which implies $\omega_1 < L_3$. We will show that there is no point (ω_1, ω_2) that satisfies conditions (i)–(v) and $\omega_1 < L_3$ on region R_3. Indeed it is enough to show that if (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies (i)–(iii) and $\omega_1 < L_3$, then it violates condition (v), i.e., $W < 0$.

If a point (ω_1, ω_2) satisfies conditions (a) $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2$, (b) $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 \geq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, (c) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 \leq \lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2}$ (which comes from (iii)) and (d) $\omega_1 < L_3$, then (ω_1, ω_2) is a point on the polygon of vertices p_0, p_6, p_7, and p_8 containing boundary except for the line segment p_7p_8, where

$$p_6 = \left(\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3),\ \frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right),$$
$$p_7 = \left(L_3, \lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - L_3\right) \text{ and}$$
$$p_8 = \left(L_3, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - L_3)\right).$$

We may check that the point p_6 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2}$, the point p_7 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda_3}{2}$ and $\omega_1 = L_3$, and the point p_8 is the intersection of two lines $\omega_1 = L_3$ and $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$.

Then, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ is an elliptic paraboloid which opens upward with minimum at p_0, and we have that $W(p_0) = -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2$, $W(p_6) = \frac{1}{48}(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$, $W(p_7) = 0$ and

$$W(p_8) = -\frac{1}{24}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{32}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2 + \frac{1}{32\sqrt{3}}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)\sqrt{-(2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3)(2\lambda_1 - 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)},$$

which are all nonpositive on region R_3. Therefore, $W(\omega_1, \omega_2) < 0$ for each point (ω_1, ω_2) on this polygon.

Now, suppose that $\omega_1 > \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_2\}$. From condition (ii) and nonnegativity of ω_2 and ω_3, we have $\omega_1 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$. From conditions $\omega_1 + 2\omega_2 \geq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, i.e., $\omega_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1)$ and (iv), we reduce $(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - U_2) \leq \omega_1 \leq U_2$. Therefore, we cannot have $\omega_1 > \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_2\}$. Therefore, if ω_1 is out of range (7.1), then Ω does not satisfy conditions (i)–(v). Hence, we conclude statement 2.

□

Consider the case of complex eigenvalues

Theorem 7.3 (complex, doubly stochastic case)**.** *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ be a list of complex numbers (containing a pair of complex conjugates) with $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3|$ and $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ be a list of real numbers with $\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \geq \omega_3$.*

1. *There is a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω if and only if the lists Λ and Ω satisfy*

   (i) $\omega_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2,$ and 3,

   (ii) $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$,

(iii) $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \geq 0$,
(iv) $(\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \geq 0$.

2. *If* Λ *and* Ω *satisfy the conditions of statement 1, the exact range for* ω_1 *is*

$$\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, U_2\}, \tag{7.6}$$

where U_2 *is as defined in (7.2). For the values for* ω_2 *and* ω_3*, we may take*

$$\omega_2 = \omega_3 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \omega_1). \tag{7.7}$$

3. *[11] The list* Λ *is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ *and* $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$,
(ii) $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0$,
(iii) $\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 \geq \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3$.

For Λ and Ω satisfying the conditions of statement 1, we find the following the doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 & \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_2 & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} \\ \omega_2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} + \sqrt{W} & \omega_1 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} - \sqrt{W} & \omega_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where W is defined in (7.5), with eigenvalues Λ and diagonal entries Ω.

Proof. 1. This statement is similar to that of Theorem 7.1. The only difference is the absence of condition (v) of statement 1 of Theorem 7.1. In fact, condition (v) is always true in this case. We may rewrite W as

$$W = \frac{3}{4}\left(\omega_1 + \omega_2 - \frac{2}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4}(\omega_1 - \omega_2)^2 - \frac{1}{12}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2,$$

which is nonnegative, because when $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$, the term $-\frac{1}{12}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2$ is nonnegative. Therefore, we have a similar proof here.

3. Suppose that the list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix. Since the doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix is also a nonnegative matrix, by statement 3 of Theorem 3.2, Λ satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) of statement 3.

Conversely, we suppose that Λ satisfy conditions (i)–(iii) of statement 3. Then, we may take values ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 as in ranges (7.6) and (7.7). Then, by statement 2, the list Ω satisfies the properties (i)–(iv) of statement 1. For example let ω_1, ω_2, and ω_3 be all equal to $\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$. Then, $\omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} = \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$ and $(\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) = \frac{1}{9}(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 - \lambda_1\lambda_2 - \lambda_1\lambda_3 - \lambda_2\lambda_3)$. Both are nonnegative, hence by statement 1, Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix. This proves statement 3.

2. We assume that statement 1 holds. Then, from statement 3, we have that $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_2 = \overline{\lambda_3}$. We first show that if the number ω_1 is within range (7.6), then taking numbers ω_2 and ω_3 with expression (7.7), the list Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). Second, we show that when ω_1 out of range (7.6), Ω does not satisfy them.

   Suppose that Ω is within ranges (7.6) and (7.7). From this we can check that $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$, which is condition (ii).

   A direct computation shows $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = \frac{1}{2}(3\omega_1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, which is nonnegative, and ω_3 is nonnegative because

$$\max\{0, \frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_2 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}\}$$
$$\leq \omega_3 \leq \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3).$$

   Hence, condition (i) is satisfied.

   A direct computation shows

$$\max\{-\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - U_2)\} \leq \omega_3 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \leq \frac{1}{6}(2\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3).$$

   Now, we show $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - U_2) \geq 0$, then we have condition (iii). Consider

$$\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - U_2) = \frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3) - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}.$$

   Since $\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$ is nonnegative, we may compute the following way

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3)\right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{4(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) + 3(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2}\right)^2$$
$$= \frac{1}{6}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) = \frac{1}{6}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\overline{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}) \geq 0.$$

   Therefore, we have $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - U_2) \geq 0$.

   A direct computation shows

$$\max\{-\frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_1\lambda_3 + \lambda_2\lambda_3), 0\} \leq (\lambda_1 - \omega_1)(\lambda_1 - \omega_2) - \frac{1}{3}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3).$$

   Hence, condition (iv) holds. Therefore, Ω satisfies conditions (i)–(iv).

   Second, we need to show that if the number ω_1 is out of range (7.6), then there exists no Ω that satisfies conditions (i)–(iv). For this proof, we refer to the proof of statement 2 of Theorem 7.1. Therefore, we conclude statement 2.

□

From conditions (ii)–(iv) of statement 1 of Theorem 7.3, we may write $\lambda_1 = a, \lambda_2 = b + ci$ and $\lambda_3 = b - ci$ where a, b, and c are real numbers. We restate statements 2 and 3 of Theorem 7.3 in terms of a, b, and c. The list becomes $\Lambda = \{a, b + ci, b - ci\}$.

Corollary 7.4. *1. The list Λ is realizable as the eigenvalues of a doubly stochastic nonnegative matrix if and only if the following hold:*

(i) $a \geq 0$,
(ii) $-\frac{a}{2} \leq b \leq a$,
(iii) $(a-b)^2 \geq 3c^2$.

2. The exact range for ω_1 *is*

$$\frac{1}{3}(a+2b) \leq \omega_1 \leq \min\{a+2b, b+\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{(a-b)^2-2c^2}\}.$$

References

[1] M. Fiedler. Eigenvalues of nonnegative symmetric matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 9:119–142, 1974.

[2] C. R. Johnson. Row stochastic matrices similar to doubly stochastic matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 10(2):113–130, 1981.

[3] A. N. Kolmogoroff. Markov chains with countably many possible states. *Bull. Moskov. Gos. Univ. Sec. A*, I (3):1–16, 1937.

[4] T. J. Laffey and H. Šmigoc. Construction of nonnegative symmetric matrices with given spectrum. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 421(1):97–109, 2007.

[5] R. Loewy and D. London. A note on an inverse problem for nonnegative matrices. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 6(1):83–90, 1978/79.

[6] E. Meehan. *Some Results on Matrix Spectra*. 1998. Thesis (Ph.D.)–University College Dublin.

[7] H. Minc. *nonnegative matrices*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1988. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

[8] B. Mourad. A note on the boundary of the set where the decreasingly ordered spectra of symmetric doubly stochastic matrices lie. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 416(2-3):546–558, 2006.

[9] B. Mourad. Errata: "A note on the boundary of the set where the decreasingly ordered spectra of symmetric doubly stochastic matrices lie" [Linear Algebra Appl. **416** (2006), no. 2-3, 546–558]. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 430(1):588–589, 2009.

[10] H. Perfect. Methods of constructing certain stochastic matrices. II. *Duke Math. J.*, 22:305–311, 1955.

[11] H. Perfect and L. Mirsky. Spectral properties of doubly-stochastic matrices. *Monatsh. Math.*, 69:35–57, 1965.

[12] R. L. Soto. A family of realizability criteria for the real and symmetric nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 20(2):336–348, 2013.

[13] R. L. Soto, M. Salas, and C. Manzaneda. nonnegative realization of complex spectra. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 20:595–609, 2010.

[14] H. R. Suleimanova. Stochastic matrices with real characteristic numbers. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)*, 66:343–345, 1949.

[15] J. Torre-Mayo, M. R. Abril-Raymundo, E. Alarcia-Estévez, C. Marijuán, and M. Pisonero. The nonnegative inverse eigenvalue problem from the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial. EBL digraphs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 426(2-3):729–773, 2007.

[16] G. Wuwen. An inverse eigenvalue problem for nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 249:67–78, 1996.